

REMARKS

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The Office Action dated October 28, 2005 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended. Claims 1-6 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,010,996 to *Hopkins et al.* (hereinafter “*Hopkins*”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, “the reference must teach every element of the claim.” The Applicants respectfully submit that *Hopkins* does not teach every element recited in claims 4-6. Thus, *Hopkins* cannot anticipate these claims. In particular, claim 4 recites a laundry dryer control panel comprising, among other features, a terminal block having a wall where “the wall shields an exposed portion of the first wire and the second wire.” *Hopkins* does not disclose this feature. In maintaining the rejection, the Office Action indicates “the claim recitation shields is broadly and reasonably construed in light of the specification to be anticipated by the shielded area disclosed in Hopkins as discussed above.” See e.g., the Office Action at page 3. The Applicants disagree. More specifically, no where does *Hopkins* disclose an exposed wire. Thus, *Hopkins* cannot disclose shielding an exposed wire. Similarly, *Hopkins* cannot disclose a terminal block having a wall which shields an exposed portion of a first wire and a second wire.

In addition, claim 4 recites “a first wire extending out of the terminal block lower part” and “a second wire extending out of the terminal block upper part.” *Hopkins* does not disclose this feature. While *Hopkins* does disclose a strain relief cover member 58 having wires

32 therein and a housing 138 having wires 170, neither the cover member 58 nor the housing 138 have both a first wire extending from a lower part thereof and a second wire extending from an upper part thereof.

In addition, claim 4 has been amended to recite that the terminal block includes “a back portion placed on the control panel and a front portion having a lower part and an upper part.” The Applicants submit that *Hopkins* does not disclose a terminal block having this feature. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that claim 4 is patentable over *Hopkins* and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claim 6, which depends from claim 4, is also patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 5 recites that the wall “covers a first connector coupling the terminal block lower part with a first power wire” and covers “a second connector coupling the terminal block upper part with a second power wire from a first side of the terminal block and a second side of the terminal block.” The Applicants submit that *Hopkins* simply does not disclose this feature. As such, claim 5 is patentable over *Hopkins* and the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action also rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,742,708 to *McCormick* (hereinafter “*McCormick*”) in view of *Hopkins*. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” The Applicants respectfully submit that neither *McCormick* nor *Hopkins*, either singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every element recited in claims 1 and 3. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite a structure for shielding an exposed part of core

wire of a terminal block in a clothes dryer “wherein the terminal block comprises a back portion placed on the control panel and a front portion having a wall for shielding an exposed part of core wire extending from an upper portion of the front portion and a lower portion of the front portion.” As correctly pointed out in the Office Action, *McCormick* does not disclose this feature. *See e.g.*, the Office Action at pages 3 and 4. Likewise, *Hopkins* also does not disclose this feature. Therefore, claim 1 is, along with claim 3 which depends therefrom, patentable over the cited references and the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action also rejected claim 2 as being unpatentable over *McCormick* in view of *Hopkins* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,820,189 to *Sergeant et al.* (hereinafter “*Sergeant*”). The Applicants traverse the rejection. As previously discussed, neither *McCormick* nor *Hopkins*, either singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest all the features recited in claim 1, the base claim from which claim 2 depends. Similarly, *Sergeant* fails to overcome the previously detailed shortcomings of both of these references. Therefore, the Applicants submit that claim 2 is patentable over *McCormick* in view of *Hopkins* in further view of *Sergeant* and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicant’s representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Application No.: 10/663,995
Amdt. dated February 28, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated October 28, 2005

Docket No.: 9988.059.00

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: February 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes ^{Ref. No.}
for Mark R. Kresloff ^{53,005}
Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant